

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

State of Oklahoma,)	05-CV-0329 GKF-PJC
)	
)	
v.)	NOTICE OF FILING PROPOSED
)	FINDINGS OF FACT AND
)	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW ON
Tyson Foods, Inc., et al.,)	DEFENDANTS' RULE 52(c) MOTIONS
)	FOR PARTIAL JUDGMENT
Defendants.)	
)	

Defendants respectfully submit the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law attached as Appendix A. These proposed findings and conclusions address the State's claims under the legal theories of nuisance *per se* and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. These proposed findings and conclusions also address the State's claims of pollution from bacteria. These proposed findings and conclusions closely follow the Court's oral findings of fact and conclusions of law on these motions. For the Court's convenience, the transcript of the Court's oral rulings is attached as Appendix B.

Defendants have also submitted an electronic copy of these proposed findings and conclusions to the Clerk of Court via email.

BY: /s/ Jay T. Jorgensen
(SIGNED BY FILING ATTORNEY WITH
PERMISSION)
Thomas C. Green
Mark D. Hopson
Jay T. Jorgensen
Gordon D. Todd
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-1401
Telephone: (202) 736-8000
Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

-and-

Robert W. George
Vice President & Associate General Counsel
Bryan Burns
Timothy T. Jones
Tyson Foods, Inc.
2210 West Oaklawn Drive
Springdale, Ark. 72764
Telephone: (479) 290-4076
Facsimile: (479) 290-7967

-and-

Michael R. Bond
KUTAK ROCK LLP
Suite 400
234 East Millsap Road
Fayetteville, AR 72703-4099
Telephone: (479) 973-4200
Facsimile: (479) 973-0007

**ATTORNEYS FOR TYSON FOODS, INC.;
TYSON POULTRY, INC.; TYSON
CHICKEN, INC; AND COBB-VANTRESS,
INC.**

BY: /s/ John H. Tucker
John H. Tucker, OBA #9110
Theresa Noble Hill, OBA #19119
RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES,
TUCKER & GABLE, PLLC
100 W. Fifth Street, Suite 400 (74103-4287)
P.O. Box 21100
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74121-1100
Telephone: (918) 582-1173
Facsimile: (918) 592-3390

-and-

Delmar R. Ehrich
Bruce Jones
Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 766-7000
Facsimile: (612) 766-1600

**ATTORNEYS FOR CARGILL, INC. AND
CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC**

BY: /s/James M. Graves
(SIGNED BY FILING ATTORNEY WITH
PERMISSION)
Gary V. Weeks
Woodson W. Bassett III
James M. Graves
Vince Chadick
K.C. Dupps Tucker
BASSETT LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 3618
Fayetteville, AR 72702-3618
Telephone: (479) 521-9996
Facsimile: (479) 521-9600

-and-

Randall E. Rose, OBA #7753
George W. Owens
OWENS LAW FIRM, P.C.
234 W. 13th Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
Telephone: (918) 587-0021
Facsimile: (918) 587-6111

**ATTORNEYS FOR GEORGE'S, INC. AND
GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.**

BY: /s/ A. Scott McDaniel
(SIGNED BY FILING ATTORNEY WITH
PERMISSION)
A. Scott McDaniel, OBA #16460
Nicole M. Longwell, OBA #18771
MCDANIEL, HIXON, LONGWELL
& ACORD, PLLC
320 South Boston Ave., Ste. 700
Tulsa, OK 74103
Telephone: (918) 382-9200

Facsimile: (918) 382-9282

**ATTORNEYS FOR PETERSON
FARMS, INC.**

BY: /s/ John R. Elrod
(SIGNED BY FILING ATTORNEY WITH
PERMISSION)
John R. Elrod
Vicki Bronson, OBA #20574
CONNER & WINTERS, L.L.P.
211 East Dickson Street
Fayetteville, AR 72701
Telephone: (479) 582-5711
Facsimile: (479) 587-1426

**ATTORNEYS FOR SIMMONS FOODS,
INC.**

BY: /s/ Robert P. Redemann
(SIGNED BY FILING ATTORNEY WITH
PERMISSION)
Robert P. Redemann, OBA #7454
PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID,
BERRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C.
Post Office Box 1710
Tulsa, OK 74101-1710
Telephone: (918) 382-1400
Facsimile: (918) 382-1499

-and-

Robert E. Sanders
YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A.
Post Office Box 23059
Jackson, MS 39225-3059
Telephone: (601) 948-6100
Facsimile: (601) 355-6136

**ATTORNEYS FOR CAL-MAINE FARMS,
INC. AND CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 27th of January, 2010, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the court's electronic filing system, which will send the document to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us

fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us

suzy_thrash@oag.state.ok.us

Kelly Hunter Foster, Assistant Attorney General kelly.foster@oag.state.ok.us

jean.burnett@oag.ok.gov

Melvin David Riggs

driggs@riggsabney.com

jsummerlin@riggsabney.com

Richard T. Garren

rgarren@riggsabney.com

delis@riggsabney.com

Sharon K. Weaver

sweaver@riggsabney.com

sdewald@riggsabney.com

David P. Page

dpage@riggsabney.com

skinnett@riggsabney.com

Riggs Abney Neal Turpen Orbison & Lewis

Robert Allen Nance

rnance@riggsabney.com

Dorothy Sharon Gentry

sgentry@riggsabney.com

jzielinski@riggsabney.com

Riggs Abney

Louis W. Bullock

lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com

Robert Murray Blakemore

bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com

bdejong@bullock-blakemore.com

nholdge@bullock-blakemore.com

Bullock, Bullock & Blakemore, PLLC

Michael G. Rousseau

mrousseau@motleyrice.com

Jonathan D. Orent

jorent@motleyrice.com

Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick

ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com

Motley Rice LLC

Frederick C. Baker

fbaker@motleyrice.com

fhmorgan@motleyrice.com

mcarr@motleyrice.com

William H. Narwold

bnarwold@motleyrice.com

Elizabeth Claire Xidis

cxidis@motleyrice.com

mjaromin@motleyrice.com

Ingrid L. Moll

imoll@motleyrice.com

Mathew P. Jasinski

mjasinski@motleyrice.com

Motley Rice

COUNSEL FOR STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Stephen L. Jantzen

sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com

dmaple@ryanwhaley.com

jlee@ryanwhaley.com

mkeplinger@ryanwhaley.com

Patrick M. Ryan

pryan@ryanwhaley.com

amcpherson@ryanwhaley.com

jmickle@ryanwhaley.com

Paula M. Buchwald

pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com

Ryan, Whaley & Coldiron, P.C.

Thomas C. Green

tcgreen@sidley.com

Mark D. Hopson

mhopson@sidley.com

Jay Thomas Jorgensen

jjorgensen@sidley.com

lsenior@sidley.com

Timothy K. Webster

twebster@sidley.com

jwedeking@sidley.com

Frank R. Volpe

fvolpe@sidley.com

Gordon D. Todd

gtodd@sidley.com

Erik J. Ives

eives@sidley.com

Cara R. Viglucci Lopez

cviglucilopez@sidley.com

Sidley Austin LLP

Michael R. Bond

michael.bond@kutakrock.com

sue.arens@kutakrock.com

Erin Walker Thompson

erin.thompson@kutakrock.com

Dustin R. Darst

dustin.darst@kutakrock.com

Kutak Rock LLP

Robert W. George

robert.george@tyson.com

L. Bryan Burns

bryan.burns@tyson.com

Timothy T. Jones

tim.jones@tyson.com

amanda.burcham@tyson.com

carol.ross@tyson.com

COUNSEL FOR TYSON FOODS, INC., TYSON POULTRY, INC., TYSON CHICKEN, INC.; AND COBB-VANTRESS, INC.

R. Thomas Lay

rtl@kiralaw.com

dianna@kiralaw.com

Kerr, Irvine, Rhodes & Ables

Jennifer S. Griffin

jgriffin@lathropgage.com

Frank M. Evans
Lathrop & Gage, L.C.

COUNSEL FOR WILLOW BROOK FOODS, INC.

cshoemaker@lathropgage.com
fevans@lathropgage.com

Robert P. Redemann
William David Perrine
Gregory Allen Mueggenborg

Perrine, McGivern, Redemann, Reid, Berry & Taylor, PLLC

rredemann@pmrlaw.net
wperrine@pmrlaw.net
gmueggenborg@pmrlaw.net
cwatson@pmrlaw.net
kcharters@pmrlaw.net

David C. Senger

Coffey, Gudgel and McDaniel, PLLC

david@cgmlawok.com
crystal@cgmlawok.com

Robert E. Sanders
E. Stephen Williams
Young Williams P.A.

COUNSEL FOR CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC. AND CAL-MAINE FARMS, INC.

rsanders@youngwilliams.com
steve.williams@youngwilliams.com

George W. Owens
Randall E. Rose

The Owens Law Firm, P.C.

gwo@owenslawfirmnpc.com
rer@owenslawfirmnpc.com
ka@owenslawfirmnpc.com

Woody Bassett
Gary V. Weeks
Vincent O. Chadick
James M. Graves
KC Dupps Tucker
Earl Buddy Chadick

Bassett Law Firm

COUNSEL FOR GEORGE'S INC. AND GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.

wbassett@bassettlawfirm.com
gweeks@bassettlawfirm.com
vchadick@bassettlawfirm.com
jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com
kctucker@bassettlawfirm.com
bchadick@bassettlawfirm.com
nmcgill@bassettlawfirm.com

Archer Scott McDaniel
Nicole Marie Longwell
Craig A. Mirkes

McDaniel Hixon Longwell & Acord PLLC

smcdaniel@mhla-law.com
nlongwell@mhla-law.com
cmirkes@mhla-law.com
lvictor@mhla-law.com
jwaller@mhla-law.com

Sherry P. Bartley

sbartley@mwlaw.com

jdavis@mwlaw.com

Mitchell, Williams, Selig, Gates & Woodyard, P.L.L.C.

COUNSEL FOR PETERSON FARMS, INC.

John R. Elrod

jelrod@cwlaw.com

vmorgan@cwlaw.com

Vicki Bronson

vbronson@cwlaw.com

lphillips@cwlaw.com

P. Joshua Wisley

jwisley@cwlaw.com

Conner & Winters, P.C.

Bruce W. Freeman

bfreeman@cwlaw.com

astall@cwlaw.com

D. Richard Funk

rfunk@cwlaw.com

Conner & Winters, LLP

COUNSEL FOR SIMMONS FOODS, INC.

John H. Tucker

jtuckercourts@rhodesokla.com

gbarber@rhodesokla.com

Colin H. Tucker

chtucker@rhodesokla.com

scottom@rhodesokla.com

Theresa Noble Hill

thillcourts@rhodesokla.com

Kerry R. Lewis

klewiscourts@rhodesokla.com

mnave@rhodesokla.com

Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones, Tucker & Gable

Terry W. West

terry@thewesetlawfirm.com

The West Law Firm

Delmar R. Ehrich

dehrich@faegre.com

dherber@faegre.com

qsperrazza@faegre.com

Bruce Jones

bjones@faegre.com

dybarra@faegre.com

eolson@faegre.com

Krisann Kleibacker Lee

kklee@faegre.com

mlokken@faegre.com

Todd P. Walker

twalker@faegre.com

bcouzart@faegre.com

lcarnahan@faegre.com

Christopher Harold Dolan

cdolan@faegre.com

cbrennan@faegre.com

Colin C. Deihl

cdeihl@faegre.com

jsullivan@faegre.com

Faegre & Benson LLP

COUNSEL FOR CARGILL, INC. AND CARGILL TURKEY PRODUCTION, LLC

Michael D. Graves
D. Kenyon Williams, Jr.

mgraves@hallestill.com
kwilliams@hallestill.com
jspring@hallestill.com

COUNSEL FOR POULTRY GROWERS

William B. Federman
Jennifer F. Sherrill

wbf@federmanlaw.com
jfs@federmanlaw.com
ngb@federmanlaw.com
law@federmanlaw.com

Federman & Sherwood

Charles Moulton

charles.moulton@arkansas.gov
Kendra.Jones@arkansas.gov
jim.depriest@arkansas.gov

Jim DePriest

Office of the Attorney General

**COUNSEL FOR THE STATE OF ARKANSAS AND THE ARKANSAS NATURAL
RESOURCES COMMISSION**

Gary S. Chilton
Holladay & Chilton PLLC

gchilton@hollidaychilton.com

Victor E. Schwartz
Cary Silverman
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP

vschwartz@shb.com
csilverman@shb.com

Robin S. Conrad
National Chamber Litigation Center, Inc.

rconrad@uschamber.com

**COUNSEL FOR AMICI CURIAE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR THE U.S. AND
THE AMERICAN TORT REFORM ASSOCIATION**

Richard C. Ford

fordr@crowedunlevy.com
kenneyj@crowedunlevy.com
burnettl@crowedunlevy.com
zaloudic@crowedunlevy.com
ecf@crowedunlevy.com

LeAnne Burnett

Crowe & Dunlevy

COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE OKLAHOMA FARM BUREAU, INC.

M. Richard Mullins

richard.mullins@mcafeetaft.com

Reuben Davis

allison.mack@mcafeetaft.com

reuben.davis@mcafeetaft.com

lisa.vann@mcafeetaft.com

McAfee & Taft

James D. Bradbury

jim@bradburycounsel.com

James D. Bradbury, PLLC

**COUNSEL FOR AMICI CURIAE TEXAS FARM BUREAU, TEXAS CATTLE
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, TEXAS PORK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION AND TEXAS
ASSOCIATION OF DAIRYMEN**

A. Diane Hammons, Attorney General

dhammons@cherokee.org

Sara E. Hill, Assistant Attorney General

sara-hill@cherokee.org

christina-carroll@cherokee.org

ccarroll@cherokee.org

danitacox@cherokee.org

sglory@cherokee.org

COUNSEL FOR CHEROKEE NATION

A. Michelle Campney

campneym@wwhwlaw.com

steelmana@wwhwlaw.com

Adam Joseph Siegel

ajsiegel@hhlaw.com

Angela Diane Cotner

AngelaCotnerEsq@yahoo.com

Barry Greg Reynolds

reynolds@titushillis.com

brogers@titushillis.com

David Edward Choate

dchoate@fec.net, brendab@fec.net

Derek Stewart Allan Lawrence

hm@holdenoklahoma.com

Douglas L. Boyd

dboyd31244@aol.com

Duane L. Berlin

dberlin@levberlin.com

blyon@levberlin.com

J. Ron Wright

ron@wsfw-ok.com

James Taylor Banks

jtbanks@hhlaw.com

Jessica Eileen Rainey

jrainey@titushillis.com

kalverson@titushillis.com

Jo Nan Allen

jonanallen@yahoo.com

bacaviola@yahoo.com

John Brian DesBarres

mrjdbd@msn.com

John David Russell

jrussell@fellerssnider.com

sortega@fellerssnider.com

tudstuen@fellerssnider.com

John Stephen Neas

steve_neas@yahoo.com

Kenneth Edward Wagner

kwagner@lswsl.com

Linda C. Martin

Lloyd E. Cole , Jr.

Mackenzie Lea Hamilton Jessie
Marcus N. Ratcliff

Mia Vahlberg

Michael Lee Carr

Michael Todd Hembree

Nikaa Baugh Jordan
Philard Leason Rounds , Jr.

Robert Park Medearis , Jr.
Ronnie Jack Freeman
Thomas Janer
Thomas James McGeady
Tim Keith Baker
Tony Michael Graham
William A. Waddell , Jr.
William Francis Smith
William S. Cox , III

sshanks@lswsl.com
lmartin@dsda.com
mschooling@dsda.com
colelaw@windstream.net
gloriaeubanks@windstream.net
melissa_colelaw@windstream.net
maci.tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net
mratcliff@lswsl.com
sshanks@lswsl.com
mvahlberg@gablelaw.com
chayes@gablelaw.com
courtfilling@gablelaw.com
hm@holdenoklahoma.com
MikeCarr@HoldenOklahoma.com
hembreelaw1@aol.com
gwendy37@yahoo.com
njordan@lightfootlaw.com
hm@holdenoklahoma.com
PhilardRounds@holdenoklahoma.com
medearislawfirm@sbcglobal.net
jfreeman@grahamfreeman.com
SCMJ@sbcglobal.net
tjmcgeady@loganlowry.com
tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net
tgraham@grahamfreeman.com
waddell@fec.net
bsmith@grahamfreeman.com
wcox@lightfootlaw.com

I also hereby certify that I served the attached documents by United States Postal Service, proper postage paid, on the following persons who are not available via electronic email notification:

John E. and Virginia W. Adair Family Trust
RT 2 BOX 1160
STILWELL, OK 74960

C. Miles Tolbert
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma
3800 NORTH CLASSEN
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73118

Cary Silverman

Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)
600 14TH ST NW STE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-2004

Cherrie House
P O BOX 1097
STILWELL, OK 74960

Donna S. Parker
34996 S 502 RD
PARK HILL, OK 74451

Doris Mares
14943 SE 15TH ST
CHOCTAW, OK 73020-7007

Dustin McDaniel
Office of the Attorney General (Little Rock)
323 Center St
Ste 200
Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

G. Craig Heffington
20144 W SIXSHOOTER RD
COOKSON, OK 74427

George R. Stubblefield
HC-66, BOX 19-12
PROCTOR, OK 74457

Gordon W. Clinton
23605 S GOODNIGHT LN
WELLING, OK 74471

J.D. Strong
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma
3800 North Classen
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Jerry M. Maddux
Selby Connor Maddux Janer
P O BOX Z
BARTLESVILLE, OK 74005-5025

Jim Bagby

RR 2, Box 1711
Westville, OK 74965

Jonathan D. Orent
Motley Rice LLC (Providence)
321 S MAIN ST
PROVIDENCE, RI 02940

Justin Allen
Office of the Attorney General (Little Rock)
323 Center St
Ste 200
Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Marjorie Garman
19031 US HWY 412
COLCORD, OK 74338-3861

Randall E. Kahnke
Faegre & Benson (Minneapolis)
90 S 7TH ST STE 2200
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3901

Richard E. Parker
34996 S 502 RD
PARK HILL, OK 74451

Robin L. Wofford
Rt 2, Box 370
Watts, OK 74964

Steven B. Randall
58185 COUNTY RD 658
KANSAS, OK 74347

Susann Clinton
23605 S GOODNIGHT LN
WELLING, OK 74471

Victor E. Schwartz
Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)
600 14TH ST NW STE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-2004

William House

P O BOX 1097
STILWELL, OK 74960

/s/ Jay T. Jorgensen

Appendix A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

State of Oklahoma,)	05-CV-0329 GKF-PJC
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	PROPOSED
v.)	FINDINGS OF FACT AND
)	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW ON
Tyson Foods, Inc., et al.,)	DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR
)	PARTIAL JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO
Defendants.)	RULE 52(c)
)	

Trial in this case commenced on September 24, 2009 with the Court as the finder of fact.

At trial, Plaintiff the State of Oklahoma asserted the following claims:

1. state law public nuisance and state law nuisance per se;
2. violation of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6972 ("RCRA");
3. federal common law nuisance;
4. trespass; and
5. violations of 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-105 and 2 Okla. Stat. § 2-18.1.

See Pretrial Order, Dkt. No. 2641 at 2 (Sept. 24, 2009). The State rested its case-in-chief on December 14, 2009. After the State rested, Defendants brought a number of midtrial motions for partial judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(c). The Court heard extensive argument on these motions from all parties over the course of three days.

Among other motions, Defendants sought judgment against the State's claims that the land application of poultry litter in the Illinois River Watershed ("IRW"): (a) is and has been a nuisance *per se*; and (b) has violated and does violate RCRA. Defendants also sought judgment on all of the State's legal claims to the extent they are based on the assertion that bacteria from the land application of poultry litter has caused or is causing pollution in the IRW.

On December 14, 2009, the Court orally granted Defendants' Rule 52(c) motion regarding the State's claim based on the theory of nuisance *per se*.¹ The Court also granted Defendants' motion with regard to the State's claims based on allegations of risks from bacteria.² On December 15, 2009, the Court orally granted Defendants' Rule 52(c) motion concerning the State's claim under RCRA.³ Defendants' other Rule 52(c) motions were denied or taken under advisement.

At the time the Court granted the three motions described above, the Court made oral findings of fact and conclusions of law on the trial record as required by Rules 52(a) and (c). The Court now supplements those oral findings and conclusions with the following written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The Court's decision is based both on its oral findings and conclusions, and the written findings and conclusions set forth below.

I. THE RULE 52(c) STANDARD

Defendants' motions are governed by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 52(a) and 52(c). Rule 52(a) provides in relevant part:

In an action tried on the facts without a jury or with an advisory jury, the court must find the facts specially and state its conclusions of law separately. The findings and conclusions may be stated on the record after the close of the evidence or may appear in an opinion or a memorandum of decision filed by the court. Judgment must be entered under Rule 58.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(1). Rule 52(c) in turn provides in relevant part:

(c) Judgment on Partial Findings. If a party has been fully heard on an issue during a nonjury trial and the court finds against the party on that issue, the court may enter judgment against the party on a claim or defense that, under the controlling law, can be maintained or defeated only with a favorable finding on

¹ Tr. at 8352:2-8353:5.

² Tr. at 8301:11-8306:23, 8353:24-8357:7.

³ Tr. at 8410:17-8413:5.

that issue. ... A judgment on partial findings must be supported by findings of fact and conclusions of law as required by Rule 52(a).

Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(c).

These provisions expressly authorize the Court to enter judgment on one or more claims after the plaintiff rests. Rule 52(c) “authorizes dismissal at the close of the plaintiff’s case if the plaintiff failed to carry an essential burden of proof.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 52 Advisory Committee Notes to 1991 Amendment; Charles A. Wright & Arthur Miller, 9 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. §§ 2371, 2573.1 (3d ed. 2008). Because the trial court sits as adjudicator of both law and fact in a bench trial, a Rule 52(c) decision is not limited to cases where the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. 9C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2573.1; *Rego v. ARC Water Treatment Co. of Penn.*, 181 F.3d 396, 400 (3d Cir. 1999). Rather, under Rule 52(c), the trial court may weigh the evidence, resolve disputed issues of fact, “and decide for itself in which party’s favor the preponderance of the evidence lies.” 9C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2573.1; *see also Roth v. American Hosp. Supply Corp.*, 965 F.2d 862, 865 & n.2 (10th Cir. 1992) (applying the former Rule 41(b), which was the precursor to the modern Rule 52(c)); *Feldman v. Pioneer Petroleum, Inc.*, 813 F.2d 296, 299 & n. 4 (10th Cir. 1987); *Woods v. North Am. Rockwell Corp.*, 480 F.2d 644, 645-46 (10th Cir. 1973); *Johnson v. Olathe Dist. Schools Unified School Dist.*, 316 F.Supp.2d 960, 962 (D. Kan. 2003). In so doing, the Court is not required to draw any inferences in favor of either party, and the Court may base its decisions on its assessment of the witnesses’ credibility. *See Blankenship v. Herzfeld*, 661 F.2d 840, 845 (10th Cir. 1981); *Tatum v. United States*, 2007 WL 756695, at *1 n.1 (E.D. Okla. Mar. 6, 2007).

Applying these standards, the Court grants the following motions on the stated grounds.

II. NUISANCE *PER SE*

A. Findings of Fact

1. Among other legal claims, the State of Oklahoma asserts that the practice of applying poultry litter to the land in the IRW constitutes a nuisance *per se*.⁴

2. Poultry litter is a mixture of poultry feces and the bedding (often wood shavings, or rice or peanut hulls) on which flocks of poultry are raised.⁵ Both in the past and currently, poultry growers, cattle ranchers, and others have spread poultry litter on fields in the IRW and elsewhere as a fertilizer and soil amendment.⁶

3. During the State's case-in-chief, the evidence showed that poultry litter can be used as a fertilizer and soil amendment in a manner that does not necessarily cause a nuisance. In other words, poultry litter does not always cause a nuisance at all times and under any circumstances, regardless of location or surroundings.

4. For example, the witnesses presented by the State testified that the State of Oklahoma regulates the use of poultry litter as a fertilizer. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 463:14-465:6, 482:20-485:8 (M. Tolbert); 2936:2-5 (T. Gunter). Under Oklahoma's regulatory system, applications of poultry litter to land in the Oklahoma portion of the IRW are performed by registered poultry farmers or certified applicators under the terms of an animal waste management plan ("AWMP") or nutrient management plan ("NMP") that is specific to the property where the poultry litter is

⁴ Pretrial Order, Dkt. No. 2641 at pp. 2-3, pp. 10-11 ¶¶57-61, pg. 20 ¶¶43-46 (Sept. 24, 2009).

⁵ *See* Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4 (S. Phillips); 1802:4-19 (B. Fisher); 3416:16-3417:1 (P. Pilkington); 4805:24-4806:7 (K. Houtchens).

⁶ *See* Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4, 1453:21-1454:17 (S. Phillips); 3724:18-3725:2, 3725:25-3726:5, 3734:4-12 (J. Pigeon); 3903:25-3904:5 (R. Collins); 3958:4-19 (D. Henderson); 4500:11-21, 4589:15-4590:18 (J. Reed); 4864:3-8 (T. Alsup); 5128:2-5, 5129:5-5132:21 (G. Johnson); 6829:3-20 (R. Taylor).

to be applied. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 464:17-466:2, 467:1-470:4 (M. Tolbert); 2899:15-2900:5, 2938:25-2944:4, 2974:16-2975:18 (T. Gunter); *see also* 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.1, *et seq.* (Oklahoma Registered Poultry Feeding Operations Act); Okla. Admin. Code § 35:17-5-1, *et seq.* (same); 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.16, *et seq.* (Oklahoma Poultry Waste Applicators Certification Act); Okla. Admin. Code § 35:17-7-1, *et seq.* (same).

5. The AWMPs are written by soil scientists under contract with the State of Oklahoma. *See* Tr. at 479:20-480:3 (M. Tolbert); 2906:25-2909:16, 2947:10-17, 2991:4-9 (T. Gunter). These soil scientists tailor each AWMP to the characteristics of the specific parcel of land to which the AWMP relates. *See* Tr. at 464:17-466:2, 489:23-490:11 (M. Tolbert); 2953:5-21, 2965:17-2967:11 (T. Gunter). The AWMPs provide instructions for the poultry grower or licensed litter applicator on how much litter can be applied to a parcel of property—and under what conditions—without discharge of pollution to the waters of the State. *See* Tr. at 2940:21-2944:13, 2958:18-2964:17, 2972:8-2975:19 (T. Gunter); 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7(C)(6)(c). Numerous poultry growers testified that they understood their AWMP provides them with instructions on “the production, handling, and distribution of wastes in a manner that prevents or minimizes degradation of air, soil, and water resources,”⁷ and the parties placed a number of AWMPs into evidence that contain language to this effect, *see, e.g.*, Defs.’ Joint Exs. 1, 3480.

6. These facts were confirmed by a number of the witnesses the State called in its case-in-chief. For example, the State presented the testimony of Teena Gunter, Deputy General Counsel for the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, who explained that an

⁷ Tr. at 3859:7-18 (J. Pigeon); *see also, e.g.*, Tr. at 3856:24-3857:20 (J. Pigeon); 3922:24-3923:2 (R. Collins); 4099:6-4104:13, 4116:19-4117:9 (B. Anderson); 4576:22-4588:25 (W.A. Saunders).

AWMP “is a document that assists the grower in knowing what to do with their litter after -- once it’s removed from the barns” and that the AWMPs incorporate “site-specific” analysis of the characteristics of each specific farmer’s poultry litter, soil and fields to prevent pollution. Tr. at 2899:15-2900:5 (T. Gunter).

7. The witnesses called by the State also confirmed that the AWMPs incorporate “Best Management Practices” that clarify the appropriate steps that should be taken when using poultry litter as a fertilizer in differing field conditions. *See* Tr. at 467:1-470:4 (M. Tolbert); 2899:15-2900:5, 2940:21-2944:13, 2958:18-2964:17, 2972:8-2975:19 (T. Gunter). The State instructs the soil scientists that the AWMPs they prepare must contain sufficient protections to ensure that there is “no discharge of poultry waste to the waters of the state” from the poultry litter application site and that the “poultry waste handling, treatment, management and removal shall not create an environmental or public health hazard.” Tr. at 467:1-470:4 (M. Tolbert); *see also* Tr. at 2940:21-2944:13, 2972:8-2975:19 (T. Gunter); 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7(C)(6)(c).

8. The State’s own former Secretary of the Environment agreed that, through these poultry litter regulations, the State of Oklahoma has decided what factors should be considered in determining how much poultry litter can be applied to a particular field, *see* Tr. at 467:1-470:4, 482:20-485:8, 486:21-487:4 (M. Tolbert), and that the State has determined that the purpose of adopting these factors is to “assist in ensuring the beneficial use of poultry waste while preventing adverse effects to the waters of the State,” Tr. at 463:11-464:2 (M. Tolbert quoting Okla. Admin. Code § 35:17-5-1).

9. The parties dispute the legal significance of the AWMPs and the State’s regulations governing the use of poultry litter. The Court need not resolve that legal dispute in ruling on the Defendants’ Rule 52(c) motion regarding nuisance *per se*. Rather, the evidence

presented in the State's case-in-chief establishes, as a matter of fact, that the State instructs the contractors who prepare AWMPs that they must tailor those documents to each field in a manner sufficient to prevent runoff or discharge of poultry litter to the waters of the State. *See* Tr. at 467:1-470:4 (M. Tolbert); 2940:21-2944:13, 2972:8-2975:19 (T. Gunter); 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7(C)(6)(c). State officials have also informed poultry growers who take mandatory training sessions that their AWMPs "will also include particular practices which [the farmer] can use to make sure that you do not have runoff of the poultry litter from your land application sites to waterways surrounding your facilities." Tr. at 2972:8-2975:19 (T. Gunter quoting Defs.' Joint Ex. 1191-A). The State's instructions to its contractors to create AWMPs with sufficient protections to prevent pollution to the waters of the State, and its messages informing farmers that the AWMPs are sufficient to prevent such pollution, are concessions that it is possible to use poultry litter in some circumstances without creating a nuisance.

10. Additionally, the State's injunctive requests in this case recognize that the use of poultry litter as a fertilizer in the IRW does not always cause environmental harm. In this case, the State requests that the Court enter an injunction prohibiting the land application of poultry litter in the IRW on fields where the soil already contains a certain level of phosphorus. For purposes of this case, the parties have discussed the measurements of phosphorus in soils as "soil test phosphorus" or "STP." *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 5159:11-5161:5 (G. Johnson). The State has proposed various cutoff levels for the injunction it requests, including that application of poultry litter be prohibited on land having an STP level of greater than 65 pounds per acre or, alternatively, 120 pounds per acre.⁸ Implicit in these requests is an acknowledgement that the

⁸ *Compare* Tr. at 64:16-20 (State's opening statement), 8285:17-20, 8352:16-8353:2, 8600:7-9 (hearing on Rule 52(c) motion); *with* Tr. at 37:22-38:3 (State's opening statement), 536:5-15 (M.

(continued on next page)

land application of poultry litter does not always create a nuisance, but instead may be done under circumstances in which it does not create a nuisance.

11. Finally, the evidence presented by the State's experts showed that poultry litter is not a nuisance in all circumstances. In testifying about soil phosphorus, Dr. Gordon Johnson opined that not all of the poultry litter that is generated within the IRW should be exported to other watersheds to prevent environmental harms, but rather that poultry litter applications in the IRW should be limited to fields where soil tests demonstrate that the field needs additional phosphorus compounds to promote plant growth. *See* Tr. at 5098:8-16 (G. Johnson). Regardless of whether the Court adopts Dr. Johnson's standard, his testimony indicates that poultry litter may be used as a fertilizer within the IRW in at least some circumstances, locations or surroundings without causing harm to nearby waters.

B. Conclusions of Law

1. The standard for a nuisance *per se* is well settled under Oklahoma law. A nuisance *per se* is "an act, occupation or structure which is a nuisance at all times and under any circumstances, regardless of location or surroundings." *Sharp v. 251st St. Landfill, Inc.*, 810 P.2d 1270, 1276 n.6 (Okla. 1991), overruled on other grounds by *DuLaney v. Okla. State Dep't of Health*, 868 P.2d 676, 678-79 (Okla. 1993); *see also McPherson v. First Presbyterian Church*, 248 P. 561, 564-65 (Okla. 1926). In contrast, a nuisance *per accidens* is "[a]n act, occupation, or structure which is not a nuisance *per se* but which may become a nuisance by virtue of the circumstances, location or surroundings." *Id.*; *see also Burlington N. & Santa Fe R.R. Co. v.*

(continued from previous page)

Tolbert), 5095:6-18, 5164:24-5165:3 (G. Johnson); *see also* Tr. at 105:3-10 (Defendants' opening statement), 8189:7-11 (hearing on Rule 52(c) motion).

Spin-Galv, No. 03-CV-162-P(J), 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30999, *13-14 (N.D. Okla. Oct. 5, 2004), overruled on other grounds by *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. v. Grant*, 505 F.3d 1013, 1022, 1023, 1029 (10th Cir. 2007).

2. Here, as discussed above, the State has not demonstrated that the land application of poultry litter in the IRW is “a nuisance at all times and under any circumstances, regardless of location or surroundings.” *Sharp*, 810 P.2d at 1276 n.6. The overwhelming evidence is to the contrary. As a result, the State has not established that the land application of poultry litter is a nuisance *per se*.⁹ The Court has therefore granted partial judgment in favor of Defendants on the State of Oklahoma’s claim based on nuisance *per se*.

3. The Court does not at this time resolve the State’s claim that the use of poultry litter as a fertilizer and soil amendment has caused a nuisance *per accidens* in the Illinois River and its tributaries or Lake Tenkiller.

III. Bacteria

A. Findings of Fact

1. In the Pretrial Order, the State based its claims in part on the allegation that bacteria from land-applied poultry litter have polluted the waters of the IRW and that these bacteria pose a risk to human health or the environment. Specifically, the State alleged that “Defendants have directly or indirectly polluted the waters of the Illinois River Watershed within Oklahoma with phosphorus in the form of phosphorous compounds and bacteria from the waste generated from the raising of Defendants’ poultry that is applied to lands in the Illinois River Watershed.” Pretrial Order, Dkt. No. 2641 at 2 (Sept. 24, 2009).

⁹ Tr. at 8352:2-8353:5 (Court’s midtrial Rule 52(c) ruling).

2. However, at trial the State presented scant evidence regarding: (a) the presence or absence of bacteria in the surface waters or groundwater of the IRW; (b) the type and number of those bacteria; (c) whether those bacteria present a risk to human health or the environment; or (d) whether those bacteria come from poultry litter or some other source. These issues were discussed in great detail during the preliminary injunction hearing in this case, *see* Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 1765 at 7 (Sept. 29, 2008), *aff'd Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma v. Tyson Foods, Inc.*, 565 F.3d 769, 782 (10th Cir. 2009), but at the trial on the merits the State did not provide similar evidence relating to bacteria.

3. At argument on the Rule 52(c) motions, the State noted that it had elected not to present substantial evidence on its claim of bacterial pollution. Instead, the State chose to focus its trial presentation on allegations of phosphorus pollution because the State believed an injunction against the land application of poultry litter based on phosphorus compounds would also serve to address the State's alleged concerns with regard to bacteria. *See* Tr. at 8302:5-15 (hearing on Rule 52(c) motion).

4. However, the State did not dismiss its claims based on alleged bacterial pollution. At argument on the Rule 52(c) motions, the State noted that some of the documents admitted into evidence contain references to bacteria in the IRW's waters. Despite these references to bacteria in some exhibits, the State conceded that "[a]dmittedly, there's not a lot of evidence in the record" on the State's claim that the land application of poultry litter has caused the waters of the IRW to become polluted with harmful bacteria. Tr. at 8356:3-11.

5. If the present case were being tried to a jury, the existence of this slight evidence might persuade the Court to defer decision on this issue until the conclusion of the trial or to permit the claim to be submitted to the jury. Because the case is being tried to the Court as

finder of fact, however, the Court may address the issue now based on its own view of the credibility and sufficiency of the evidence. *See Roth*, 965 F.2d at 865 & n.2; *Feldman*, 813 F.2d at 299 & n.4; *Blankenship*, 661 F.2d at 845; *Tatum*, 2007 WL 756695, at *1 n.1; 9C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2573.1; *see also* Tr. at 8356:12-16.

6. Although the record contains some evidence concerning the issue of bacterial pollution, the Court concludes as a matter of fact that the evidence introduced by the State is not sufficient to prove that (a) the land application of poultry litter has caused the surface waters or groundwater of the IRW to become polluted with bacteria; or (b) bacteria from poultry litter pose a risk to human health or the environment in the IRW.

B. Conclusions of Law

1. All of the State's bacteria claims are premised on allegations that the land application of poultry litter has polluted the surface waters or groundwater of the IRW with bacteria, and these bacteria present a risk to health or the environment. Although there is some evidence on bacteria in the trial record, the Court has weighed the evidence and found as a trier of fact that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate that the land application of poultry litter in the IRW has caused the presence of pathogenic bacteria in the waters of the IRW, or created a risk to health or the environment. In light of the Court's conclusion that the factual evidence is insufficient to support claims of bacterial contamination, the Court has granted partial judgment in favor of Defendants on all of the State of Oklahoma's bacteria claims.¹⁰

¹⁰ Tr. at 8301:11-8306:23, 8353:24-8357:7 (Court's midtrial Rule 52(c) ruling).

IV. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

A. Findings of Fact

1. Poultry litter is an agricultural commodity for which there is both a market and a market value in the IRW. Numerous witnesses called by the State testified that poultry litter is bought, sold and traded in the IRW and has been for many years. *See* Tr. at 3734:4-12 (J. Pigeon); 3901:10-16 (R. Collins); 4507:18-4508:3 (J. Reed); 4552:19-4553:18, 4589:15-4590:18 (W.A. Saunders) (poultry litter currently sells for \$15 per ton in the barn); 6831:17-6832:5 (R. Taylor) (poultry litter has cash value). The money that poultry growers receive from selling poultry litter is often used to offset other farm costs. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 4497:1-4498:3 (J. Reed); 4555:15-4556:2, 4590:19-4591:10 (W.A. Saunders). Specifically, several poultry growers called by the State testified that they use the money obtained from the sale of poultry litter to purchase clean bedding to be used in raising new flocks of poultry. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 4497:1-4498:3 (J. Reed); 4555:15-4556:2, 4590:19-4591:10 (W.A. Saunders).

2. Poultry litter has market value because it is beneficially used as a fertilizer and soil amendment.¹¹ Witnesses called by the State admitted that “[t]he main benefit of litter becomes its use as fertilizer. The litter has nutrient value for forages” Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4 (S. Phillips quoting Ok. Ex. 5881 at 7); *see also* Tr. at 4500:11-21 (J. Reed) (testifying that poultry litter can be superior to commercial fertilizers in certain respects). In addition, the evidence at trial showed that poultry litter has agricultural value as a soil amendment apart from the value of the litter’s nutrient content. As Shannon Phillips, the director of the Water Quality

¹¹ *See* Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4, 1453:21-1454:17 (S. Phillips); 3724:18-3725:2, 3725:25-3726:5, 3734:4-12 (J. Pigeon); 3903:25-3904:5 (R. Collins); 3958:4-19 (D. Henderson); 4500:11-21, 4589:15-4590:18 (J. Reed); 4864:3-8 (T. Alsup); 5128:2-5, 5129:5-5132:21 (G. Johnson); 6829:3-20 (R. Taylor).

Division of the Oklahoma Conservation Commission, explained, some soils are depleted of organic material and the “bedding material (rice hulls or wood shavings)” in poultry litter “provides organic matter that helps improve soil quality.” Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4 (S. Phillips quoting from Okla. Ex. 5881 at 7). Ms. Phillips also confirmed that adding organic material to soil can reduce the risk that the soil will erode. *See* Tr. at 1453:21-1454:17 (S. Phillips). Dr. Gordon Johnson agreed that poultry litter may provide certain micronutrients to the soil, and may improve soil pH, improve water retention of soil, and promote aggregation of soil particles. *See* Tr. at 5129:5-5132:21.

3. Efforts to transport poultry litter out of the IRW have sometimes encountered difficulty because neighbors of poultry growers want to purchase the litter, and poultry growers accede to this local demand. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 1457:8-19 (S. Phillips). In fact, some poultry growers regularly sell litter to their neighbors. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 3734:4-12 (J. Pigeon); 4471:15-23 (J. Reed). It is also common for poultry growers to use the poultry litter produced on their farms for their own agricultural operations. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 1457:8-25 (S. Phillips); 4471:15-23, 4497:1-4498:3 (J. Reed). A number of poultry growers called by the State testified that they have multiple agricultural activities on their farms (such as raising cattle and other livestock), and that they view poultry litter as part of the compensation that they receive for growing poultry. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 3958:4-3959:8 (D. Henderson) (it is common for farmers to own both poultry and cows and to use the litter to raise forage); 4421:19-4422:2 (S. Storm) (“Typically one of the benefits of a contractual relationship [with a poultry company] is that the contract grower wants the manure for their own land for fertilizing purposes.”); 4574:8-19 (W.A. Saunders) (poultry litter from grower operation increased cattle production four-fold). Joel Reed testified that he became a poultry grower in part to obtain poultry litter for use on his cattle pastures, and

that without poultry litter his cattle operations would be curtailed. *See* Tr. at 4490:4-4491:6 (J. Reed) (“If I didn’t have the litter, I wouldn’t be able to afford to fertilize my land and I would probably have to cut my cattle herd two-thirds.”); *see also* Tr. at 4497:1-4498:3 (J. Reed). He was not alone. Al Saunders testified that he became a poultry grower specifically because he wanted to secure a source of poultry litter for his cattle fields and other agricultural operations, and that his use of poultry litter has allowed him to expand his cattle operations. *See* Tr. at 4570:2-4571:18 (W.A. Saunders).

4. It is well established on this record that poultry litter has value in the marketplace as a fertilizer and soil amendment, and that poultry growers, ranchers and others in the IRW routinely use poultry litter by applying it to pastures and other crops as a fertilizer and soil amendment.¹² For example, Shannon Phillips testified that “[p]oultry production offers agricultural producers an additional source of income with the added benefit that poultry litter is an excellent fertilizer resulting in pastures that can support additional head of cattle.” Tr. at 1446:14-1447:11 (S. Phillips quoting from Ok. Ex. 5881 at 3). Ms. Phillips clarified that raising poultry offers cattle ranchers multiple extra sources of income because “[t]here is the potential that they could sell the litter and [using the litter as fertilizer] also provides them the opportunity to raise additional cattle.” Tr. at 1447:3-11 (S. Phillips).

5. Poultry litter is also used as a form of payment for services rendered. Roger Collins, a licensed commercial poultry litter applicator, testified that he provides the service of cleaning old poultry litter out of poultry houses in exchange for litter, which he then sells

¹² *See* Tr. at 1448:16-1449:4, 1453:21-1454:17 (S. Phillips); 3724:18-3725:2, 3725:25-3726:5, 3734:4-12 (J. Pigeon); 3903:25-3904:5 (R. Collins); 3958:4-19 (D. Henderson); 4500:11-21, 4589:15-4590:18 (J. Reed); 4864:3-8 (T. Alsup); 5128:2-5, 5129:5-5132:21 (G. Johnson); 6829:3-20 (R. Taylor).

(sometimes in conjunction with his litter-application services) to other farmers. *See* Tr. at 3891:22-3892:15 (R. Collins).

6. The market for poultry litter is not limited to the IRW. Rather, poultry litter is bought, sold and traded in a marketplace that is not defined by the boundaries of any particular watershed. The evidence shows that a substantial amount of poultry litter is exported from the IRW for use as a fertilizer in other areas. *See* Tr. at 1369:18-1371:20, 1376:23-1380:11 (S. Phillips); 3058:9-24 (M. Henderson); 3721:15-3722:11 (J. Pigeon); 3931:7-3933:3 (R. Collins); 4306:14-4307:12 (B. McClure); 4498:4-4499:25 (J. Reed); 4552:19-4553:18 (W.A. Saunders); 4637:11-25 (S. Patrick); Ok. Ex. 1231; Ok. Ex. 2535; Ok. Ex. 5881. However, the exact amount of poultry litter that is exported (either now or in the past) is not clear from the record evidence.

7. The agronomic rate of a particular nutrient for a particular plant is the amount of that nutrient necessary for the growth of that plant. *See* Tr. at 372:25-373:2 (M. Tolbert); 955:19-25 (Fite).

8. The State's expert Dr. Gordon Johnson acknowledged that the land application of poultry litter can benefit soil even in the absence of an agronomic need for phosphorus,¹³ and the state regulations governing the use of poultry litter in the IRW do not limit the land application of litter to the agronomic rate. *See* Tr. at 5089:4-7 (G. Johnson); *see also* Tr. at 465:7-466:2 (M. Tolbert).

9. The State has offered insufficient evidence to convince the Court that farmers, ranchers or other applicators in the IRW place (or have placed) litter on the ground solely to

¹³ *See* Tr. at 5169:4-13 (G. Johnson); *see also, e.g.*, Tr. at 4484:6-16 (J. Reed) (poultry grower's testimony that he applies litter in the absence of agronomic need for phosphorus "because I need nitrogen to grow my grass").

discard it. The State’s expert Dr. Bert Fisher was unable to testify to any practice in the IRW of people land-applying poultry litter for the sole purpose of disposing of it. *See* Tr. at 2439:1-2440:12 (B. Fisher). Grower Al Saunders likewise testified that he knows of no one who land-applies litter to get rid of it, adding that such a practice “makes no sense at all” given the monetary value of the litter. Tr. at 4589:15-4590:18 (W.A. Saunders).

B. Conclusions of Law

1. The evidence establishes that poultry litter is not a “solid waste” within the meaning of RCRA and therefore the State’s RCRA claim must be dismissed.

2. To prevail in its claim under RCRA’s citizen suit provision, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1)(B), the State must prove among other things that each Defendant “contributed to or is contributing to the handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of solid ... waste” as that term is defined in RCRA. *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. v. Grant*, 505 F.3d 1013, 1020 (10th Cir. 2007). The phrase “solid waste” is a legal term of art when used in the context of a RCRA claim.

3. Under RCRA, the term “solid waste” includes material from agricultural operations to the extent that the material is “garbage, refuse” or other “discarded material.” 42 U.S.C. § 6903(27). The statute provides in relevant part:

The term ‘solid waste’ means any garbage, refuse, sludge from a waste treatment plant, water supply treatment plant, or air pollution control facility and other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gaseous material resulting from industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations, and from community activities

Id. The State does not claim that poultry litter is “garbage” “refuse” or “sludge” within the

meaning of RCRA,¹⁴ and therefore the Court must examine whether poultry litter constitutes “other discarded material.”¹⁵

4. The parties dispute the correct legal standard for determining whether a material is “discarded” and thus “solid waste” under RCRA. The Court declines to adopt either party’s position wholesale. However, this legal dispute is not determinative of the Court’s decision in this case. On the record before the Court, poultry litter would not qualify as “discarded material” under any of the parties’ legal interpretations.

5. It is well established that material is considered to be “discarded” where it is disposed of, thrown away or abandoned. *Am. Petroleum Inst. v. EPA*, 216 F.3d 50, 55-56 (D.C. Cir. 2000); *see also Am. Mining Congress v. EPA*, 824 F.3d 1177, 1183-84 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (“The ordinary, plain-English meaning of the word ‘discarded’ is ‘disposed of,’ ‘thrown away’ or ‘abandoned.’”). On this point the parties agree. Additionally, the parties agree that the term discarded cannot encompass materials that are “destined for beneficial reuse or recycling in a continuous process by the generating industry itself.” *Am. Mining Congress*, 824 F.3d at 1186 (emphasis omitted).

6. In the present case, as discussed above, the evidence overwhelmingly contradicts any suggestion that poultry litter is being “discarded” in the sense of being disposed of, thrown away or abandoned. The evidence establishes that farmers (including poultry growers, cattle ranchers and others) value poultry litter and pay substantial value to obtain it. They do so for the

¹⁴ See Pretrial Order, Dkt. No. 2641 at 9-10 ¶46. Such claims would not be supported by the evidence in this case, in any event.

¹⁵ The State originally alleged that land-applied poultry litter is also a “hazardous waste” under RCRA, but the State is no longer pursuing that claim. *See* Aug. 13, 2009 Summ. J. Hrg Tr. at 150:11-151:12 (Dkt. No. 2533) (Aug. 27, 2009).

purpose and with the effect of using the litter as a fertilizer and soil amendment to support their agricultural enterprises. Although some poultry growers may have more poultry litter than they need for their own farms (or more than they can use on their own lands under the limits established in the governing Oklahoma and Arkansas regulations), there is a ready market to exchange this excess litter for cash, clean bedding for new poultry flocks, or other goods or services. On the extensive record before it, the Court is unpersuaded that poultry growers or others are applying (or have applied) poultry litter to the land simply to be rid of it.

7. The State argues that poultry litter is “discarded” because some fields in the IRW need nitrogen and some of the other nutrients that poultry litter contains, but do not need additional phosphorus for their current crop. But a substance does not necessarily become a solid waste within the meaning of RCRA when it is applied to the normal beneficial usage for which the product was intended merely because some beneficial aspect of the product is not fully utilized. In other words, the fact a field in the IRW may have a particular level of soil test phosphorus is not in itself determinative of whether poultry litter has been “discarded.”

8. In determining whether a material is a “beneficial” product or a RCRA solid waste, courts have examined whether (1) the material has market value; (2) the party intended to throw the material away or put it to a beneficial use; and (3) the material has at least an incidental beneficial effect in its usage. *See Safe Food & Fertilizer v. EPA*, 350 F.3d 1263, 1269 (D.C. Cir. 2003). None of these factors is outcome determinative, but rather each informs the Court’s view of the evidence. In this case, all of these factors point to the same conclusion—that poultry litter is not a RCRA “solid waste.”

9. The State argues that poultry litter must be considered a solid waste under RCRA because it is not used to raise more poultry and thus is not part of “beneficial reuse or recycling

in a continuous process by the generating industry itself.” *Am. Mining Congress*, 824 F.3d at 1186. The Court finds this reading of *American Mining Congress* unpersuasive. As the Court has previously noted, the D.C. Circuit has made clear that, while it held that materials that are reused by the same industry in a continuous process are not RCRA solid waste, that does not mean that all materials must undergo such continuous reuse to avoid being classified as RCRA solid waste. *See Safe Food & Fertilizer*, 350 F.3d at 1268. One can easily imagine materials or substances that are generated in one industry and beneficially used in another without being “discarded.” *See id.*

10. However, the Court would reach the same result on the facts of this case even if the State’s position were the law. Poultry litter is reused within the same agricultural industry that creates it. Indeed, the record evidence demonstrates that at the current time there are only limited uses for poultry litter outside of agriculture, although research is ongoing into other uses that may be developed. Numerous poultry growers testified that they contract with Defendants specifically in order to obtain access to poultry litter, which they use to in their agricultural operations to grow crops to support their cattle operations. *See, e.g.*, Tr. at 4490:4-4491:6, 4497:1-4498:3 (J. Reed); 4570:2-4571:18 (W.A. Saunders). In such an operation, the use of poultry litter as a fertilizer can be seen as part of one process that begins with the introduction of birds and feed to the farm, and concludes with the production of several valuable agricultural products, including forage, hay and cattle.

11. Finally, the State argues that a complaint filed by the Department of Justice in the case *United States v. Seaboard Foods, LP*, 5:06-cv-00990-HE (W.D. Okla.) (Sept. 14, 2006) (filed previously as Dkt. No. 2130-6, Ex. 91 (June 2, 2009)), establishes that animal manures are “solid waste” under RCRA. The Court finds this argument unpersuasive. In *Seaboard*, the EPA was primarily concerned with hog effluent leaking from plastic lined pits and the infrastructure,

including piping, that held the hog effluent. *See Seaboard Foods* Administrative Order (filed previously as Dkt. No. 1626-8 & 1626-9, Ex. 6 (Mar. 11, 2008)). Thus, although the *Seaboard* complaint mentioned land application of swine effluent, the government's focus was not on this practice. Moreover, the characterization of swine effluent as a RCRA "solid waste" was merely an allegation in the complaint, which was filed as part of the parties' agreement to a consent decree. The *Seaboard* court never addressed the merit of the United States' assertion, and the government's mere allegation is not determinative on the legal issue here.

12. For the foregoing reasons, the Court concludes that the State has failed to establish that the land application of poultry litter in the IRW constitutes the discard of a RCRA "solid waste". Because proof of the involvement of a "solid waste" is an essential element of the State's RCRA claim, the Court has granted Defendants' Rule 52(c) motion with regard to the State of Oklahoma's claim under RCRA's citizen suit provision, 42 U.S.C. § 6972(a)(1)(B).

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2010.

Hon. Gregory K. Frizzell
United States District Judge
Northern District of Oklahoma